

July 1, 2015

Karen Wong Assistant Director Public Safety Communications Office 601 Sequoia Pacific Boulevard Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Wong:

The City of Tehachapi and the Tehachapi Police Department recently applied to be recognized as a "New" Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) and requested funding for equipment through the CA 9-1-1 Branch. Mr. William Anderson from your office was extremely supportive and devoted a significant amount of time and hard work in conducting a thorough review of our application. The call data obtained during the review revealed an anticipated call volume of approximately 211 calls per month via the 9-1-1 system. Unfortunately, this anticipated call volume does not meet the recently established criteria requiring an agency to provide documentation supporting an anticipated call volume of 300 or more 9-1-1 calls per month. Based upon this factor, our application and funding to become a PSAP was denied.

We believe Mr. Anderson was extremely fair in evaluating our anticipated call volume and we clearly understand the logic behind the call volume criteria, we however do not believe our inability to meet this call volume is cause for denial or more importantly, the appropriate decision for our community.

As we have previously discussed with you, the Tehachapi Police Department is the only municipal police agency in the community and is responsible for the majority of calls for service within the community. The City of Tehachapi is a growing community, which will undoubtedly reach the call volume criteria in the very near future. The currently recognized PSAP (Bear Valley) is a Community Services District only providing police services to a gated, residential community. There is limited growth anticipated for this area and the call volume will not likely experience much change in the future.

While the City of Tehachapi and the Tehachapi Police Department recognize the benefits of PSAP consolidation and the importance of utilizing the CA 9-1-1 Branch resources in the most efficient manner possible, it is our belief that the citizens of Tehachapi will receive an improved level of service by recognizing the Tehachapi Police Department as a "New" Public Safety Answering Point. With the future establishment of NG9-1-1 and State Broadband (FirstNet), it is critical to correct the alignment of public safety and 9-1-1 services in the Tehachapi community.

We would respectfully request an opportunity to appeal this decision and have the opportunity to present our argument before the 9-1-1 Advisory Board. We appreciate your careful consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kent Kroeger, Chief of Police

Greg Garrett, City Manager

cc:

Jean Fuller, Senator

Shannon Grove, Assemblywoman

Suzanne Foxx, ACCAP

Response to the City of Tehachapi's July 1, 2015 Letter

Paragraph #1

Average call volume per month in 2014 is 211. Call stats are as follows:

Bear Valley Call Statistics for 2014

| ESN # | # of Calls | Direct 9-1-1 Calls |
|----------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| 352 | 850 | Bear Valley (Tehachapi) |
| 354 | 428 | Bear Valley Springs |
| 848 | 1814 | Bear Valley PD - Wireless calls |

| ESN # | # of Calls | Transferred 9-1-1 Calls to Bear Valley |
|----------|---------------|--|
| 341 | 2 | Bakersfield PD |
| 342 | 2 | Kern Co. SHF-West Side |
| 348 | 5 | Kern Co. SHF - East Side |
| 646 | 1 | Unknown |
| 843 | 33 | CHP - Bakersfield Area |
| 847 | 2 | Bakersfield PD |
| 852 | 201 | Kern Co. SHF |
| | 246 | Total 9-1-1 Calls Transferred |

| ESN # | # of Calls | Transferred 9-1-1 Calls to Bear Valley via 10-digit |
|----------|---------------|--|
| | 45 | Bakersfield CHP - 10-digit Emerg. |
| | 188 | Bishop CHP - 10-digit Emerg. |
| | 233 | Total 9-1-1 Calls Transferred |

| | ESN # | # of Calls | LEC Test Calls (not counted) | |
|---|----------|---------------|------------------------------|--|
| ĺ | 998 | 15 | LEC Trunk Testing | |

To determine the percentage of wireless 9-1-1 calls for Tehachapi:

850 + 428 = 1,278

850 divided by 1,278 = 66%

66% of 1,814 = 1,197

1,197 + 850 + 246 + 233 = 2,5262,526 divided by 12 months = 211 calls

Tehachapi PD's potential monthly call volume: 211

Estimated Cost for a New PSAP

Approximate cost of new CPE:

\$185,000.00

Network Non-reoccuring Costs:

\$5,389.00

Network reoccuring Monthly Cost:

\$618.00

Paragraph # 2

CA 9-1-1 Branch "New" Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Funding Policy:

Funding Criteria

The requesting agency must meet the following Funding Criteria.

- 1. Be a public agency as defined in Government Code Section 53101: "Public agency as used in this article, means the State, and any city, county, city and county, municipal corporation, public district, or public authority located in whole or in part within this State which provides or has authority to provide firefighting, police, ambulance, medical, or other emergency services".
- 2. Submit a letter on agency letterhead to the CA 9-1-1 Branch with the following:
 - a. description of the current 9-1-1 call processing procedures for the agency's jurisdiction;
 - **b.** confirmation that the requesting agency will be staffed with 9-1-1 call-taker(s) and commit to answer 9-1-1 calls 24 hours per day, every day of the year, for a minimum of five (5) years;
 - c. documentation, such as emergency incident reports, to support an anticipated call volume of 300 or more 9-1-1 calls per month and proposed benefits of funding (by the CA 9-1-1 Branch) to improve emergency response to 9-1-1 callers in their jurisdiction and,
 - d. commitment that the PSAP (when requesting agency is law enforcement) will support the redistribution of wireless 9-1-1 calls from the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to the requesting agency's PSAP by agreeing to accept wireless calls directly as a primary PSAP. (Fire and emergency medical response agencies receive wireless 9-1-1 calls via transfer as secondary PSAPs.)
- 3. Complete an EMERGENCY NUMBER SYSTEM PLAN/AGREEMENT (TDe-280, Rev. 2/08) form (provided to PSAP by the CA 9-1-1 Branch) with signatures from participating PSAPs that agree to send/receive 9-1-1 calls to/from the requesting agency; and, signatures of the Sheriff, or Police Chief, or Fire Chief, and Finance Officer to acknowledge financial penalties that will be imposed to the PSAP by the CA 9-1-1 Branch if the 5-year commitment is not met.
 - a. Subsequent to a detailed review of the documentation requested in Funding Criteria 1 and 2 above, the TDe-280 form will be initiated by the CA 9-1-1 Branch consultant who will insert projected "start-up" costs under "CA 9-1-1 Branch 5-Year Funding Plan Costs".
 - **b.** The TDe-280 with "startup" costs provided will then be sent to the requesting agency as "pending approval" until the form is completed by the PSAP and returned to the CA 9-1-1 Branch for final approval and a funding commitment.

Paragraph #3

The Bear Valley Police Department's Dispatch Services has been an approved and funded PSAP since 1982 or longer and has been providing call taking and dispatch services to the City of Tehachapi.

The Bear Valley Community Services District Police Department's eligibility fails within the Warren-911-Emergency Assistance Act, Government Code 53101 which states: "Public Agency," as used in this article, means the state, and any city, county, city and county, municipal corporation, public district, or public authority located in whole or in part within this state which provides or has authority to provide firefighting, police, ambulance, medical, or other emergency services.

Paragraph #4

There is no indication of service degradation or complaints from the community as a result of the Bear Valley Police Department answering 9-1-1 calls and dispatching for the City of Tehachapi.